

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 23, 2007. Claims 18-27 are presented for examination, of which Claims 18 and 23 are in independent form. Claims 18 and 23 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 18 and 23 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,076,728 (*Davis et al.*), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,860,073 (*Ferrel et al.*). Applicants submit that independent Claims 18 and 23, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 18 is directed to a method for facilitating editing of webpage interface elements, the method comprising obtaining an XML tag identifying a selected webpage interface element, wherein the XML tag is utilized in a plurality of webpages to identify a plurality of occurrences of the selected webpage interface element, accessing a configuration file corresponding to the XML tag and stored on a centralized server, wherein the configuration file provides data formatting rules for the selected webpage interface element, based on the XML tag, and editing the configuration file to change the data formatting rules for the selected webpage interface element, wherein the changed data formatting rules resulting from the edited configuration file changes an appearance of the selected webpage interface element in the plurality of webpages.

An important feature of Claim 18 is that the configuration file can be stored on a central server. By virtue of centralization, the configuration file can be placed remote to multiple user systems. Moreover, the configuration file is not required to be delivered to the viewer's computer should there be a change in the configuration. The editing of the configuration file can take place in a single, centralized location.

Davis et al. relates to a publishing system that uses XML and does not teach, suggest, or otherwise result in the obtaining, accessing, and editing features as recited in Claim 18.

Ferrel et al., as understood by Applicants, relates to a method of linking web pages to independent standardized style sheets, with the style sheets residing on the user's computer and the webpage rendered within the viewer's computer. (*Ferrel et al.*, col. 40, lines 13-17). In addition, a rendering application in addition to a standard HTML viewer must be installed on the user's computer prior to utilization of the system. (*Ferrel et al.*, col. 12, lines 11-17). Moreover, any time "the designs or styles change" the system will send a new design descriptions or style sheets to the user, effectively editing each style sheet on each viewer's computer instead of a central class definition. (*Ferrel et al.*, col. 39, lines 48-50). *Ferrel et al.* does not update a configuration file stored on a centralized server in Claim 18, but rather updates a multitude of configuration files which are distributed to each viewing device.

In stark contrast, *Ferrel et al.* teaches away from the practice of updating a central format file and having the rendered web page transmitted to the clients under the rationale of keeping transmission overhead down. (*Ferrel et al.*, col. 39, lines 50-55).

Since *Ferrel et al.* speaks negatively of such a feature as recited in Claim 18, Applicants respectfully contend that a prima facie case for obviousness has not been met.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 18 is patentable over *Davis et al.* and *Ferrel et al.*, considered individually or in any permissible configuration, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claim 23 recites features similar to those of Claim 18 and therefore is also believed to be patentable over *Davis et al.* in view of *Ferrel et al.* for at least the reasons discussed above. Claims 19-22 depend from Claim 18, and claims 24-27 depend from Claim 23. For at least the reasons discussed above, these dependent claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over *Davis et al.* and *Ferrel et al.*.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1495270_1